

Chapter 4

The Constitution of FOCUS: West Greenlandic Eskimo & Haida

1. *Introduction*

In this chapter, we introduce West Greenlandic Eskimo and Haida and outline portions of two languages which are associated with the expression of FOCUS. One language will exploit sentence initial position and one, sentence final position. They will also differ in how/whether they wed other semantics with FOCUS, and they will differ in how they associate other semantics with FOCUS. These interplays afford us the opportunity to enrich our conceptualization of FOCUS.

2. *West Greenlandic Eskimo*

West Greenlandic Eskimo (WGE) is a language that places S, O, and V in that order in the most neutral expressions:¹

SOXV is clearly the neutral order (Sadock 1984.196)

¹ The following is from the webpage of the Alaska Native Language Center (<http://www.uaf.edu/anlc/>):

Although the name “Eskimo” is commonly used in Alaska to refer to all Inuit and Yupik people of the world, this name is considered derogatory in many other places because it was given by non-Inuit people and was said to mean “eater of raw meat.” Linguists now believe that “Eskimo” is derived from an Ojibwa word meaning “to net snowshoes.” However, the people of Canada and Greenland prefer other names. “Inuit,” meaning “people,” is used in most of Canada, and the language is called “Inuktitut” in eastern Canada although other local designations are used also. The Inuit people of Greenland refer to themselves as “Greenlanders” or “Kalaallit” in their language, which they call “Greenlandic” or “Kalaallisut.” Most Alaskans continue to accept the name “Eskimo,” particularly because “Inuit” refers only to the Inupiat of northern Alaska, the Inuit of Canada, and the Kalaallit of Greenland, and is not a word in the Yupik languages of Alaska and Siberia.

The most neutral order for major sentence constituents is S O V ... The most neutral word order is S O V ... the verb most commonly expressing the kernel of new information (Fortescue 1984.93, 174)

but it is also noted that variation in order is possible

The order of major elements with a WG clause is quite free (Sadock 1984.196)

There is ... considerable variation around these unmarked orderings (Fortescue 1984.93)

2.1 *The senses of order in WGE*

Some of the possibilities of the ordering are illustrated in the following (Fortescue 1984.181):²

- | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| (1) | piniartu-p | puisi-Ø | pisar-aa | |
| | [hunter-ERG | seal-ABS | catch-3sg3sg.INDIC] | |
| | 'The hunter caught the seal' | | | |
| | | | | |
| (2) | piniartu-p | pisar-aa | | puisi-Ø |
| | [hunter-ERG | catch-3sg3sg.INDIC | | seal-ABS] |
| | | | | |
| (3) | puisi-Ø | pisar-aa | | piniartu-p |
| | [seal-ABS | catch-3sg3sg.INDIC | | hunter-ERG] |

The alternate expressions of (2) and (3) differ from (1) in what appears finally, *puisi-Ø* 'seal' and *piniartu-p* 'hunter'. The semantic effect of (2) is that it "puts emphasis/focus on it (the seal - not s.th.else/as opposed e.g. a walrus)" (Fortescue 1984.181). Sentence (3) "could be used — with a non-lowered pitch on the final constituent — in answer to a question as to who performed the given action, with *piniartup* emphasized contrastively by virtue of its placement in the position most strongly felt to relate to new information ..." (Fortescue 1984.181).

WGE appears to use sentence final position as the signal of FOCUS and to associate preferentially that content with the EVENT. Content other than the S and O may occupy the final position and be thereby 'emphasized' by FOCUS (Fortescue 1984.182, 187):

² Although Fortescue uses 'rel[ative]' as a grammatical label for *-p*, I have replaced it with 'ergative' to make the notation consistent with others, e.g. Sadock (1984) and Bittner (1987).

- (4) immaqa ugaluvvik-Ø taku-at kisianni immaqa
 [perhaps church-ABS see-2sg3sg.INDIC but perhaps
 taku-nngil-at **uqaluvvi-tuqaq-Ø**
 see-not-2sg3sg.INDIC church-old-ABS]
 ‘You saw (perhaps) the church, but perhaps you didn’t see the *old*
 church’
- (5) kinguninngua takkup-put **angut-it marluk**
 [a.while.later show.up-3pl.INDIC man.pl two]
 ‘A while later two men showed up’
- (6) aallaan-ni=li tunniup-paa **Aggu-mut**
 [gun.his-REFL=but give-3sg3sg.INDIC Aggu-ALL]
 ‘But he gave his gun to Aggu’
- (7) tamanna pi-sar-puq **urtuupari-mi**
 [this take.place-HABITUAL-3sg.INDIC October-Loc]
 ‘This would take place in October’

In each sentence of (4) - (7), final position is also following the grammatical expression of the EVENT. Of (5), Fortescue (1984.182) explains, “An indefinite NP subject (or object), introduced for the first time, may well appear after the verb (though it is far from necessary) without further emphasis”. And of (6) and (7), “Also oblique (e.g. indirect object) nominals and adverbials may be moved from [sic] their most neutral positions for emphasis, in particular to position following the verb for an indirect object indicating the new or essential information ...” (Fortescue 1984.183). Material may follow the Verb **without** the content of FOCUS, but when that happens, the content represents “‘afterthought’ material in the nature of further clarification (usually with lowered pitch)” (Fortescue 1984.182).³ Because the EVENT preferentially associates with FOCUS, and is ‘neutrally’ in final position, “It is not strictly speaking possible to emphasize a verb, by movement alone, since any movement from its neutral clause final position results rather in the emphasis of one of its nominal arguments moved relative to it” (Fortescue 1984.186-187).

Fortescue has noted of (3) that that it may be used to respond to a question concerning who caught the seal, and we may suppose that (2) will equally

³ Recall Fortescue’s comment on (3) above that the sentence final *piniartu-p* ‘hunter’ be uttered “with a non-lowered pitch”.

constitute an answer to a question concerning what the hunter caught. But Fortescue (1984.22) comments that in responding to question-word questions:

The usual response to a q-word question is to fill the constituent slot questioned in the corresponding case or mood form required ... It is not usual to repeat more of the question than that constituent.

Thus, we find these question and answer pairs (Fortescue 1984.23):

- (8) (a) kia uqaatig-aa
 [who.ERG talk.about-3sg3sg.INTER]
 ‘Who talked about it?’
- (b) uuma
 [he.ERG]
 ‘He (did)’
- (9) (a) su-tu-ssa-visi
 [what-eat/drink-FUT-2pl.INTER]
 ‘What will you have to drink?’
- (b) uanga hoffi
 [me Hof]
 ‘A Hof (beer) for me’
- (10) (a) su-mut ilaa-gavit
 [what-ALL travel.by-2s.CAUS]
 ‘What did you come by?’
- (b) helikopteri-mut
 [helicopter-ALL]
 ‘By helicopter’

Effectively, the answers in (8) - (10) are sentence final as are the FOCUSES in (4) - (6).

Sentence initial position in WGE has a content that complements the FOCUS of sentence final position. In addition to the three orderings of (1) - (3), there also exist the XSOV and OSXV possibilities; “The orders XSOV and OSXV are quite frequent” (Sadock 1984.196). Fortescue (1984.181, 183) provides these examples:

- (11) **puisi-Ø** piniartu-p pisar-aa
 [seal-ABS hunter-ERG catch-3sg3sg.INDIC]
- (12) **ursuq-Ø** tulukka-p tinngup-paa
 [blubber-ABS raven-ERG fly.away.with-3sg3sg.INDIC]
 ‘A raven flew away with the blubber’

“... an NP subject in neutral position, by virtue of filling the position most usual for ‘given’ information, will, all else being equal, be taken in a definite sense” (Fortescue 1984.182); hence, ‘the hunter’ in (1). But in (12) *tulukka-p* is ‘a raven’ (and presumably in [11], the gloss is ‘A hunter caught the seal’). Initial “position for an object NP is particularly common if it refers back anaphorically to preceding context” (Fortescue 1984.183). And (11) “treats the object as theme (what the sentence is about, as usual, the subject)” (Fortescue 1984.181). Compare further this sentence (Fortescue 1984.193):

- (13) **Jenseni-kkut** **piquta-at** imiarsu-up
 [Jensen.&.family-ERG luggage.their-Pl ship-ERG
 Malik Dani-p nassar-pai
 Malik Dan-ERG bring-3sg3sg.INDIC]
 ‘The ship Malik Dan brought the Jensen’s luggage’

In (13), “taken from a context where the arrival of the Jensen family in Greenland is already being discussed but how their luggage reached them has not been mentioned, the object NP is thematized by fronting ... However, ‘topic’-creation is not the only function such fronting can perform ... and it is by no means obligatory to thematize new material in this way” (Fortescue 1984.193).

Sentences (8a) and (9a) illustrate two of the three variant ways in which question-word questions may be formed in WGE. In (8a) and (14), the question-word occupies the neutral position which its non-question word congener would fill (Fortescue 1984.12):

- (14) raaja-t **su-mum-makku** aatu-ssa-gaat
 [shrimp-Pl what-ALL-these use-FUTURE-3pl3pl.PARTICIPLE]
 ‘What will they use these shrimp for?’

In (9a) and (15) (Fortescue 1984.14), the question-word is sentence final:

- (15) pinissat tassa **suu**-ppat
 [pinissaaat that.is be.what-3pl.INTER]
 ‘What are ‘pinissat’ (kamik stuffing)?’

And the question may appear in sentence initial position (Fortescue 1984.12):

- (16) **su**-mi kalaallisut ilinnia-ravit
 [what-LOC Greenlandic learn-2sg.CAUS]
 ‘Where did you learn Greenlandic?’ (having heard the addressee speak it)

2.2 Conclusion

We have seen that *wh*-question words in languages like English do not require that the question word be accompanied by the content of FOCUS, while other languages do require that combination, e.g. Eastern Armenian, Rwanda, and Yogad. WGE exemplifies a language which stands between these two extremes. Question words may appear in three grammatical locations: (i) in the position a non-question, statement word would appear, i.e., the S, the O, or the X positions, (ii) sentence finally, and (iii) sentence initially. In sentence final position, the sense would be that of an English question-word question with sentence accent on the question word; i.e. the English gloss of (15) would be ‘Whát are ‘pinissat’?’ The semantic contrast marked by positioning WGE question-words sentence initially and by placing them in their ‘neutral’ position is a distinction that is not accurately reflected in English, and not at all in E. Armenian. If English allows

- (17) (a) Where did you learn Greenlándic?
 (b) You learned Greenlandic whére?

then (17b) would be the closer to the WGE question in (16) since (17b) is appropriate to a context in which the speaker’s ability to speak Greenlandic has been somehow betrayed, as is the case in the context of the WGE question of (16). That would leave (17a) as the closest approximation of a supposed WGE question: *kalaallisut **sumi** ilinnia-ravit*.

3. *Haida*⁴

The grammar of FOCUS in Haida, as in WGE, turns upon the use of word order. There has been some debate concerning the “basic” order of elements in Haida, but

Reasonably careful work on Haida has uniformly led to the conclusion that basic word order is SOV ... [but] the relative order of two NPs makes no difference to interpretation when only one of them can be taken to be subject (or object) ... It appears then that word order in Haida is to be taken as rigid only when it is needed to identify subject or object. (Enrico 1986.91-92)

Thus (Enrico 1986.96 and 2003.74-75),⁵

⁴ Haida is sometimes assigned to a large group of North American languages called Na-Dene, but Levine (1979.170) concludes that “if Haida is indeed a Na-Dene language, the proof has yet to be submitted. Until it is done, Haida ought to be treated like any other language (e.g. Ainu or Basque) for which no convincing evidence has been offered to link it genetically with any other, and which is therefore formally described as an isolate ...”

⁵ Over the years, with many people working on Haida, the systems of transcription have differed. I have written the examples in the notation each has developed. Some will write *hl* (Edwards 1982) where others will write *ɬ* (e.g. Welsch 1975). Some will write geminate vowels *aa* and so forth (Edwards 1982 and Enrico 1986) where others will write *á* and so forth (Welsch 1975). Enrico (1986) writes the third person emphatic pronoun *ʔlaa/ʔla*. Cf. (22) below. The only place where differences in transcription may cause confusion is in the writing of the postposition that indicates a strong degree of focus. It has been written variously as *ō* (Swanton 1908), *uu* (Edwards & Eastman 1983), *huu* and *ɕuu* (Enrico 1986), and *.uu* (Enrico 2003). The *ɕ* that Enrico writes is “an unrealized consonant” (Enrico 1986.94). In Enrico 2003, the period symbol ‘.’ is substituted (Enrico 2003.14): “There may be some objection to using the period as an orthographic symbol, but omitting any representation of phonemic empty C slot plays havoc with tone and with various alternations”. In discussions of this element in the text, I shall arbitrarily use *ɕuu*.

Enrico (1986.91) is describing “Northern Haida (Masset and Alaskan/Kaigani)” as is Edwards (1982): “an Alaska dialect of Haida, Kaigani, as spoken at Hydaburg, Alaska” (17). Welsch (1975.118) describes the dialectal situation as follows:

Since Swanton published a linguistic account of the Haida language spoken on the Queen Charlotte Islands of British Columbia, three dialects have been generally acknowledged. These are the Masset, Skidegate and Ninstints dialects. There is no published account of Ninstints which has no known living speakers. The other two dialects are primarily spoken in the towns for which the dialects are named, both of which are on Graham Island. According to Swanton (1911:209), the Haida who live in Alaska on Prince of Wales Island speak Masset dialect.

Swanton points out that a large number of Haidas moved from the northwestern Queen Charlotte Islands to Alaska around 1700-1760. At the time he was studying the Haida, these Alaskan Haida sometimes referred to as Kaigani, were living in three villages. About 1911, the Christian community of Hydaburg was formed when the residents of Howkan, Klinkwan and Kasaan were brought together.

Haida as spoken by residents of Hydaburg appears to differ from the

- (18) (a) 7adaàhl-çuu Bill gyuùdan-ee sdasgiid-an
 [yesterday- Bill horse-def kick-past]
 ‘Bill kicked the horse yesterday’
 *‘The horse kicked Bill yesterday’
- (b) 7adaàhl-çuu gyuùdan-ee Bill sdasgiid-an
 [yesterday- horse-def Bill kick-past]
 ‘The horse kicked Bill yesterday’
 ‘Bill kicked the horse yesterday’
- (19) (a) 7adaàhl-çuu gyuùdan-ee t’sagt’sag-gee 7is-tlagaay-gan
 [yesterday- horse-def wagon-def causative-hurt-past]
 ‘The horse damaged the wagon yesterday’
 *‘The wagon hurt the horse yesterday’
- (b) 7adaàhl-çuu t’sagt’sag-gee gyuùdan-ee 7is-tlagaay-gan
 [yesterday- wagon-def horse-def causative-hurt-past]
 ‘The wagon hurt the horse yesterday’
 ‘The horse damaged the wagon yesterday’

Whether two nouns in a sequence before the verb can be heard as S + O or O + S depends on their “relative animacy”: human, animal, and inanimate. “If and only if NP A is ranked greater than NP B in animacy, then can A be subject even when preceded by B” (Enrico 1986.96). Because ‘horse’ is **not** greater in animacy than ‘Bill’ in (18), the sequence *Bill gyuùdan-ee* will always be heard with *gyuùdan-ee* ‘horse’ as the Transitive Object. In (18b), where the PARTICIPANT with lesser animacy precedes one with greater animacy, two glosses are possible. In (19b), because the second noun, *gyuùdan-ee* ‘horse’ is greater than *t’sagt’sag-gee* ‘wagon’, ‘horse’ can be heard as the S in (19b), but in (19a), *t’sagt’sag-gee* ‘wagon’ cannot be heard as the ‘S’. In Enrico 2003, the semantic contrast among nouns is revealed to be more finely graded (Enrico 2003.76): “A number of properties bear on an evaluation of potency of an entity: acquaintance, social rank, humanness,

Masset dialect reported by Swanton.

On the same issue, Edwards (1982.17) comments:

The history of Alaskan Haida dates back no more than 400 years when internal pressures led to migration from the Queen Charlotte Islands ... Alaskan Haida has diverged somewhat from that spoken in the Canadian islands, though all dialects are mutually intelligible.

animacy, and number ... The categories in order of decreasing potency are: known single adult free humans, non-adult and/or enslaved and/or unknown and/or grouped humans; non-human higher animals; inanimates and lower organisms (fish and lower)".⁶ Accordingly, we find additional asymmetries as this (Enrico 2003.76):

- (20) 7adàahl-.uu Bill ja.adee qing-gan
 [yesterday- Bill the.woman see-past.tense.suffix]
 ‘Bill saw the women yesterday’
 *‘The women saw Bill yesterday’

Because there remains formal variation like that illustrated in (18) and (19), it will be more profitable **not** to assign Haida to one or another language types (as SOV or OSV), but to inquire how Haida exploits the opportunity for word order variation to semantic ends.⁷ While there is variation in how Haida places material to the left of the verb, the language is apparently resolutely verb final: “The Haida clause is strictly verb-final ...” (Enrico 2003.45) and “In Haida, everything comes before the verb ...” (Eastman & Edwards 1983.64).

3.1 *çuu* and ‘newsworthiness’

In seeking to identify the presence of FOCUS, we shall depend upon our announced heuristic (Chapter 3) of seeking first to learn how the language responds to *wh*-questions. In Haida, the grammatical combination of initial position and the enclitic *çuu* is clearly involved in replies to *wh*- questions as well as in the formation of *wh*- questions themselves (Enrico 1986.97):

The first constituent of statements and questions is commonly found to be followed by a clitic particle *huu* (*çuu* in most environments).

Although there are not a lot of examples in the literature of a question directly paired with its answer, sentences (21) and (22) illustrate this (Enrico

⁶ This recalls the Great Chain of Being in Navajo (Frischberg 1972) and Agent Hierarchies. Cf. Chapter 34.

⁷ The alternative order posited for Haida has been OSV. Edwards (1979.147) concludes:

Since it is not possible to demonstrate that an OSV order predominates in Haida, given the preponderance of utterances containing initial elements with topic [sic] markers and given the tolerance of syntactic and semantic ambiguity with respect to subject/object order, little will be gained by considering the language as OSV.

1986.106):

- (21) giisd-**ϕuu** k'ajuu-gang? Bill-gu k'ajuu?⁸
 [who- sing-present Bill-question sing]
 'Who is singing? Is it Bill that is singing?'
- (22) gee, 7laa-**ϕuu** gam suu-ϕang-gang
 [no 3p- neg pro.verb-neg-present]
 'No, it is not he who is singing'
 (or 'No, hé's not singing.')

Initial position with *ϕuu* is also employed in the **absence** of formal questions, thus extending the sense of this grammar beyond that of a response. There are usages such as (Enrico 1986.100):

- (23) sginn ts-aay-**ϕuu**-7a dan hl taa-da-gaa
 [Skeena salmon.egg-def- -here you I eat-have-present]
 'I am feeding you Skeena River salmon eggs here'
 (I.e. you see me giving you something and I tell you what it is.)

There are still other contexts that are appropriate to the grammar of initial position and *ϕuu*:

'Contrastive' (Enrico 1986.101)

- (24) 7laa suu-s-**ϕuu** t'alang gudang-gan
 [3p speak-relative.tense- we hear-past]
 'It was her that we heard speaking'
 (Preceding this, the speakers were asked if they had really heard so-and-so's voice, not someone else's.)

⁸ The second portion of (21) illustrates a yes-no question, which requires the clitic *-gu* to follow the first element in the sentence. "The obligatory interrogative particle *gu* can only precede the verb, so a yes/no question must always include a nonverbal constituent, a host for *gu*. Occurrence as a host for *gu* need not be interpreted as being focused, especially when only one preverbal constituent occurs" (Enrico 1986.104). When a verb occurs as the only component of a PROPOSITION, "the adverb *huu* (elsewhere having the demonstrative meaning 'there')" carries *gu* (Enrico 1986.105):

- (i) huu-gu tajuu
 [there-question be.blowing]
 'Is it windy?'

‘Presentational’ (Enrico 1986.101)

- (25) 7aasgee k’wiy-ee-**ϕuu** 7la
 [this soil-def- 3p
 gaw-daa-yaa-n
 be.small.amount-have-nonwitnessed-past]
 ‘He made this soil (land) small’

The morphosyntax extends further to expressions of ‘Dismay’ (Enrico 2003.155)

- (26) giijii-**ϕuu** ’la tlaay sq’iilaa-gaang-7ahl
 [too.bad- 3p handiwork be.dirty-frequentive-must]
 ‘Too bad everything she does is dirty’ (M)⁹

and of ‘Wishes’ (Enrico 2003.169)

- (27) gijgwaa-tl’aa-**ϕuu** dii gwii Ø ridriid-ang
 [hopefully-but- me to 3p make.it-present]
 ‘I hope I get it’ (S)

and of ‘Affirmation’ (Enrico 2003.263)

- (28) yaan-**ϕuu** 7adàahl Bill 7isgyaan Joe n-ee
 [truly- tomorrow Bill and Joe house-definite
 ’la k’udlan-7aw-ee-ga Mary gudang-gang
 3p paint-plural-infinitive-postposition Mary want-present]
 ‘It’s true that Mary wants Joe and Bill, them to paint the house
 tomorrow’ (M)

and ‘Insistence’ (Enrico 2003.128)

- (29) cil-**ϕuu** tl’a taa-gang-gwaa, hlqin”
 [medicine- Indefinite eat-present-emphatic Dear]
 ‘Eat the medicine, Dear!’ (M)

And finally, in these examples, the grammar (Enrico 2003.201, 202):

⁹ Some usages are specific to the Skidegate or to the Masset dialect of Haida, and these examples are marked by ‘S’ or ‘M’, respectively.

- (30) (a) 7wa-.ahl-**ɕuu** 'laa 7waa-s-ran la
 [that-because- 3p do-present-postposition 3p
 7unsad-aa-n
 know-evidential-past]
 'Because of that he knew that it was he who had done it'
 (M)
- (b) kiij-.uu q'adal-gan
 [pus- burst-past]
 'The puss burst'

does not respond to some silent question or some probable misunderstanding, but explains the reason for a conclusion. Sentence (30a) occurs where “no contrasting reasons are provided or readily imaginable”(201), and (30b) was “given as an explanation for a sudden smell” (202).

Initial position coupled with *ɕuu* is apparently asserting the relevance of the content so isolated, prompted by a variety of motivations, not all of them the missing information associated with answers to *wh*-questions. What appears constant in all these uses is an increment of insistence on the FOCUSED content, an urging to the listener to heed this content especially. And it happens that *wh*-questions and their answers qualify for this increased prominence ... as do (23) - (30). When such examples as this (Enrico 1986.120)

- (31) s-galang-ee-t'laa-**ɕuu** sk'adi-yee-da 7la gudang
 [song-def-but- learn-nom-postposition 3dp want
 7iw7waan-aa-n
 very.much-nonwitnessed-past]
 'That song, however, he very much wanted to learn it'

are included, the sense of this grammar broadens further. Enrico (1986.119) characterizes the semantics of the *ɕuu* grammar in (31) in this way: “They are reminders of what has been previously discussed and signals of what the present sentence is about. In other words, they serve at once to specify topic and to tie it to preceding discourse”. The combination is appropriate also in the initiation of conversations/narratives, where no topic has yet been established (Enrico 1986.102):

- (32) (a) Hello

- (b) k'waay, nang-**ϕuu** ka-t'saa-ng-**gwaa**
 [wait, indef.pronoun- walk-in-present-]
 'Wait, someone is coming in'

“Noteworthiness” is the one-word summary of this morphosyntax (Enrico 1986.122).¹⁰

If FOCUS directs one’s attention to what is of interest in relation to other content (‘Look here first’), then

- (i) content that is inherently unexpected, surprising, or of interest in its relation to other content, or
- (ii) content that is inherently expected, not surprising, or not of interest in relation to other content

may have a special relation to the semantics and grammar of FOCUS. Question words and answers to them represent an ‘extreme’ of pointed interest; and on the other side, pronouns should in themselves represent an ‘extreme’ lack of pointed interest. An example of the inability of some content to co-occur with FOCUS is found among the indefinite pronouns: “In most cases indefinite pronouns cannot be focussed” (Enrico 2003.451, 462, 464):

- (33) (a) **tl'a** 7ists'a-gan
 [indefinite come.in-past]
 ‘Some people came in’
- (b) **tl'aa₂** 'la₁ 'laanuu-gan
 [indefinite 3p heap.abuse.on-past]
 ‘He₁ heaped abuse on them₂/people₂' (M)
- (c) ***tl'aa-uu** dang qing gayaa.ad-sa-ang
 [indefinite- you see might-future-present]
 ‘They might see you’

¹⁰ While Enrico (1986.103) observes that “The data in this article suggest that *huu* [i.e., *ϕuu*] is used to mark a constituent as noteworthy”. Edwards and Eastman commonly refer to it as “emphatic”. The conclusion in Enrico 2003 is more conservative:

Haida structural focus [i.e., initial position in combination with *ϕuu*, PWD] does in fact have a pragmatic function: it is clearly used only when the speaker assumes a lack of information — a contrary expectation, question, a real or potential misunderstanding. (195)

And the reason, in the summarizing vocabulary of Enrico, is that they are not sufficiently ‘noteworthy’.

3.2 *Initial position*

In the same way that *ϕuu* is involved in questions and their answers, while being not irrevocably bound to the semantics of questions and answers, we find that in some conditions, question words (but not answers) can occur without *ϕuu* (Enrico 2003.206 & 227-228):

- (34) (a) Joe-gu guus taa-gaa?
 [Joe- what eat-evidential]
 ‘What did Joe eat?’
- (b) huu-gu Joe guus taa-gaa?
 [there-question Joe what eat-evidential]
 ‘What did Bill eat?’ (M)
- (35) (a) guus-.uu giisda taa-.asa-ang?
 [what- who eat-future-present]
 ‘What did who kill?’ (S)
- (b) giisd-.uu giisda sgunaa-gaa-ng
 [who- who kiss-evidential-past.question.word]
 ‘Who kissed who?’ (S)

The presence of *gu* in (34) introduces and illustrates a second postposition that, in addition to *ϕuu*, combines with initial position to qualify FOCUS. Unlike *ϕuu*, *gu* does not seem to occur directly following the *wh*-words, e.g. *guus* ‘what’, *giisda* ‘who’, *gidlaan* ‘where’, *giisand* ‘when’, etc. Again, unlike *ϕuu*, *gu* is employed to form yes-no questions (Enrico 2003.194, 209):

- (36) (a) ’laa-gu dang squdaa-yaa?
 [3p- you punch-evidential]
 ‘Did you punch him?’ (M)
 ‘Did he punch you?’ (M)

- (b) huu-gu tadaa?¹¹
 [there- cold]
 ‘Is it cold?’ (M)

Despite these differences and the existence of near minimal pairs such as this one (Enrico 2003.285):

- (37) (a) 7aa-gu tliits’aan?
 [here- where]
 ‘Is this where?’ (M)
- (b) 7aa-.uu tliits’aan-7aa.
 [here- where-fragment]
 ‘This is where’ (M)

the precise contrast between the choice of *ϕuu* and *gu* seems not to have been explored. The apparent pairing of the two in constructing a yes/no-question and a yes/no-answer in (37) suggests a difference in which *ϕuu* is the more forceful and assured in isolating its content for FOCUS, while *gu* is less so.¹²

¹¹ The Masset dialect requires that some material appear before *gu* in its initial position, hence the *huu* in (33b). The Skidegate dialect does not require this, and (i) is possible (Enrico 2003.209):

- (i) gu tadaa?
 ‘Is it cold?’

¹² Some further understanding of the nature of the contrast between *gu* and *ϕuu* might be gained from the possibility of focussing either the Transitive Agent in a yes/no-question or the Transitive Object. That is, in addition to the question (Enrico 2003.208):

- (i) tlaalang-gu Mary daang-aa?
 [husband+own- Mary divorce-evidential]
 ‘Did Mary divorce her husband?’

there might exist the complement:

- (ii) Mary-gu tlaalang daang-aa?
 [Mary- husband+own divorce-evidential]

The question would then be “What is the difference?” Does it lie in who divorced who? Or in what what the focus of interest is, e.g. *Did Máry divorce her husband?* or *Did Mary divorce her húsband?* Or both, or something else?

Enrico does say of (ii) that it occurs as an echo question reflecting the Haida equivalent of ‘Why did Mary divorce her husband’:

In texts, *ϕuu* (and *gu*) are not frequent at all. In the two available (accessible) published Haida texts, *ϕuu* is not common. Edwards & Eastman (1983) provide a text with 92 numbered distinct utterances. In Edwards & Eastman's text, *ϕuu*, which they write as *uu*, occurs 38 times, and 3 of those are recurrences in the same utterance. Less than 40% of the Haida sentences in this text contain *ϕuu*. In the Swanton's (1908) collection of texts cited by Enrico, there is one text which contains interlinear glosses making it accessible to a reader not fluent in Haida.¹³ In Swanton's transcription, *ϕuu* usually appears as \bar{o} , and attached as the final syllable to some word. \bar{o} is frequently not morphologically segmented in the transcription. Swanton's text is composed of 193 punctuated sentences. With the shape \bar{o} , *ϕuu* occurs at most 15 times; that is, it appears in about 7% of the sentences. Clearly, sentence initial position and *ϕuu* are **distinct**, both grammatically and semantically, though related.

The absence of *ϕuu* from initial position, the existence of non-initial *wh*-words in (34) and (35) without *ϕuu*, and the presence of other postpositions in addition to *ϕuu* as augments to FOCUS in initial position lead us to conclude

-
- | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|------|-------------|---------------------|
| (iii) | guus-raganaan-.uu | Mary | tlaalang | daang-aa? |
| | [what-because.of- | Mary | husband+own | divorce-evidential] |

Given the diminished assertiveness of *gu* in other examples, this is expected. But what would the echo question be for the following (assuming this to be an acceptable Haida utterance):

- | | | | | |
|------|-------------------------------------|-------------|------|---------------------|
| (iv) | guus-raganaan-.uu | tlaalang | Mary | daang-aa? |
| | [what-because.of- | husband+own | Mary | divorce-evidential] |
| | 'Why did her husband divorce Mary?' | | | |

The answers to these questions are not provided, but still what we know of *gu* enriches our understanding of Haida FOCUS. If there exists a Haida pairing to (i) with *ϕuu*, e.g.:

- | | | | |
|------|---------------|------|---------------------|
| (vi) | tlaalang-.uu | Mary | daang-aa |
| | [husband+own- | Mary | divorce-evidential] |

it most certainly would not be an echo-question, but a bald assertion, 'It was her husband Mary divorced'.

Finally on *gu*, we add this example (Enrico 2003.187):

- | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|-------------|-------|----------|
| (vii) | 7aa-gu | tlii | ginn | qwaan |
| | [here- | quite.a.bit | thing | be.lots] |
| | 'Such a lot!' (M) | | | |

One wonders if this expresses disbelief at seeing so much? I.e. not a assertion.

¹³ The remaining texts in the collection are arranged in columns: the English on the left and the Haida on the right. Except for dividing the Haida into a series of utterances, there is no analysis, nor is there any indication how the two columns match. There are no texts in Enrico 2003.

that the essential grammar here is

initial position alone.

That is, *wh*-words, *ϕuu* and *gu* (and similar postpositions) are a grammatical penumbra surrounding the core syntax of initial position. They are elements compatible with the semantics of the grammar of initial position, but they occur as modulations of it. They are a facet of FOCUS, but they themselves are not the constant signal of FOCUS. Initial position alone is.

3.3 *Where ϕuu is absent : The complement to “noteworthiness”*

The absence of ‘noteworthiness’ does not entail the absence of FOCUS. If the ‘noteworthiness’ associated with *ϕuu* (and *gu*) exists, it does so because it contrasts with circumstances which are not. If question words and pronouns occur in sentence initial position only with *ϕuu* because they are emphatically ‘noteworthy’ FOCUSES, then we may expect there to be a foundation of ‘normal’ FOCUS which these postpositions augment. The ‘normal’ FOCUSES should not use *ϕuu*, precisely because they **are** the norm.

There is such a background FOCUS, and we can detect it in three of the common orderings in Haida. Without *ϕuu* or *gu*:

- (i) When a noun and a pronoun co-occur together as ‘S’ and/or ‘O’, it does not matter which is which, the order is noun + pronoun.¹⁴
- (ii) When two pronouns occur together, the order is ‘O’ + ‘S’. No variation is possible.¹⁵
- (iii) When two nouns occur together, and they differ in ‘potency’ (cf. above), the one that is the less POTENT is ‘S’ only when it is initial. I.e., the expectation is that the less POTENT one is the PARTICIPANT affected, and to be the affecting PARTICIPANT, it is required to be placed in sentence initial position.

We have seen examples of (iii) above in (18) and (20). Sentences (38) and

¹⁴ “Subject-fronting is obligatory when the object constituent is a pronoun and the subject is not ... when the subject constituent is a pronoun subject-fronting does not apply” (Edwards 1982.71-72).

¹⁵ “Order of grammatical functions in case all complements are pronominal is object-subject” (Enrico 2003.46). Cf. also Enrico 2003.389-391.

(39) illustrate (i) and (ii), respectively (Edwards 1982.72):¹⁶

- (38) (a) Fred laa tii-gan
 [Fred him/her kill-past]
 'Fred killed him/her'
- (b) *laa Fred tii-gan
- (39) (a) laa I tii-gan
 [him/her s/he kill-past]
 'S/he killed him/her'
- (b) *I laa tii-gan

The unacceptability of (38b) and (39b) confirms the asymmetries in order cited in (i) and (ii), and they also raise a question of how Haida overcomes the restriction to say things like the reverse of (38a), 'He/She killed Fred' (Eastman & Edwards 1979.50 and Edwards 1982.72):

- (40) (a) Fred I tii-gan
 [Fred s/he kill-past]
 'S/he killed Fred'
- (b) *I Fred tii-gan

Given that only noun + pronoun + verb is possible, the flexibility required to distinguish between ROLES is provided by two pronominal paradigms (Cf. Enrico 2003.92-95). The 'O'-pronoun takes one shape in (38), and the 'S'-pronoun another in (40). If the pronoun is additionally to be FOCUS, then Haida requires it to appear in sentence initial position. And in doing so, two things happen: (i) the pronoun which appears is the 'S'-pronoun in a slightly modified form.¹⁷ And the pronoun must be followed by *ɕuu*. Sentence (41a) is

¹⁶ There is general agreement on (i) and (ii). Cf. Eastman (1979.142), Edwards (1982.39), and Enrico (1986.91).

¹⁷ The modification provides the name for this class of pronouns, the 'hlaa' class (Edwards 1982.40):

According to Kess (1974.37) there are two main pronominal classes in Haida, the *hlaa* class, named for the first person agentive pronoun *hlaa* 'I', which "would be topics

glossed ‘I am eating fish’ while (41b) is glossed ‘Í am eating fish’ (Welsch 1975.122):

- (41) (a) **chiin aahl** taa-gang¹⁸
 [fish I eat-present]
 ‘I am eating fish’
- (b) **hlaa-o** chiin taa-gang
 [I- fish eat-present]
 ‘Í am eating fish’

The same pattern characterizes the ‘O’-pronoun, although no example is provided in the sources.

Thus, we have the correlations in Figure 1.

Sentence initial	Sentence second
Normal	Normal
FOCUS	NON-FOCUS
Noun	Pronoun
'O' pronoun	'S' pronoun
Less POTENT	More POTENT
'S' noun	'O' noun

Figure 1: ‘Normal’ FOCUS in Haida.

If the descriptions of Haida are accurate, the distributions in Figure 1 are invariant. Without *çuu*, these orders constitute the norm. In discussing them, we must first reiterate our assumption from Chapter 1 that languages by-and-large will not do things arbitrarily. There will be a motivation to their

[sic] of the agentive verb sentence in which they occurred” (ibid:39) and the *dii* class, named for the first person stative pronoun *dii* ‘I’, which “appears in sentences that contain a stative or ambient verb, as objects of agentive verb phrases or as objects of various prepositional particles, and lastly, as possessives with certain classes of nominals” (ibid:40) ...

Earlier Swanton (1911.256) has referred to the contrasting series as “subjective” and as “objective”. Welsch (1975.120) refers to them as “emphatic” and “declarative”.

¹⁸ “*ał* [i.e., *ahl*, PWD] frequently contracts to *ł* [i.e., *hl*, PWD] and usually merges with the prior syllable” (Welsch 1975.122)”.

grammars, and Figure 1 therefore means something. In order to discover that meaning, we must keep in mind that the relations in Figure 1 are relative. There is a proportion. The presence of noun in initial position in place of pronoun, is as the presence of ‘O’-pronoun in initial position in place of ‘S’-pronoun; and both are as the presence of Less-POTENT-‘S’-noun in initial position in place of More-POTENT-‘O’-noun. There is an implied shared semantic thread running through the items of the first column, that opposes them to a similarly common thread that runs through the items of the second column. That is, the preference of Noun over Pronoun initially has the same explanation as preference for the ‘O’-pronoun and not the ‘S’-pronoun in initial position; and finally, the presence of the less POTENT ‘S’ noun over the more POTENT ‘O’ noun in initial position.

A PARTICIPANT named by a noun is (by that fact) constituted as less expected/less familiar, more contextually foreign and hence more to be heeded than is a PARTICIPANT named by a pronoun. Generally, that is what it means to use a noun in place of a pronoun.

For two familiar PARTICIPANTS, which are named by pronoun, and which are then equivalent in terms contextual disturbance, it is the PARTICIPANT in the ‘O’ function which is less expected and more to be heeded than is the one in the ‘S’ function.¹⁹

And finally, it is so expected for a more POTENT PARTICIPANT to act on a less POTENT one, that when two PARTICIPANTS appear in that order — more preceding less POTENT — it is not possible to hear the second PARTICIPANT as the Agent. Thus, there is no sequence of a more POTENT ‘O’ PARTICIPANT preceding a less POTENT ‘S’ PARTICIPANT. Even with the added ‘noteworthiness’ of *ϕuu*, it is difficult to hear the reverse. Enrico (2003.246-247) provides this example:

- (42) Bill-.uu x-aay q’usgiid-an
 [Bill- dog-def bite-past]
 ‘Bill bit the dog’/‘The dog bit Bill’ (M)

and remarks “Out of context, speakers will tend to interpret ... [42] in accordance with the usual ordering principles, i.e. taking Bill to be the subject. But given a context like ‘Who did the dog bite?’, then ... [42] is the proper

¹⁹ We have seen similar treatment of the ‘O’ function before in the Bantu languages ... in which, if the FOCUS is not the EVENT, then it must be the PARTICIPANT which is filling the ‘O’ position. The PARTICIPANT which is the ‘S’ can **never** be FOCUS. And we will see the affinity of ‘O’ for FOCUS again when we look at Warao.

answer if Bill was the one bitten.” Thus, the order,

- (43) x-aay Bill q’usgiid-an
 [dog-def Bill bite-past]

is clearly not the ‘natural’ one, but it is one way of expressing ‘The dog bit Bill’ (cf. Enrico 2003.79).²⁰ In order to effect the unnatural combination of less-POTENT-acting-on-more-POTENT, the semantic contribution of initial position is required.

Reviewing the opposed pairs of Figure 1, we find that initial position:

- (i) is wedded to the name that identifies the contextually introduced PARTICIPANT, the ‘strange’ member of the noun-pronoun pair.
- (ii) is wedded to the Object ROLE, when two pronouns co-occur, identifying the more contingent of the ROLE pair Object and Agent
- (iii) facilitates the unnatural combination of less-POTENT-acting-on-more-POTENT.

²⁰ This asymmetrical pattern has been long noticed. Cf., for example, Silverstein (1976). The troublesome gloss for (42) may have another source. Eastman (1982.50) observes “When the topic marked constituent [i.e., marked by FOCUS *çuu*, PWD] is not a pronoun, an anaphoric pronoun may still exist in the comment”. These are from Edwards (1982.50) and Eastman & Edwards (1979.46):

- (i) (a) Fred uu chiin l taa-gang
 [Fred fish he eat-present]
 ‘It’s Fred that’s eating fish’
- (b) chiin uu Fred laa taa-gang
 [fish Fred it eat-present]
 ‘It’s fish that Fred is eating’
- (c) chiin uu Fred l taa-gang
 [fish Fred it eat-present]
 ‘It is the fish that is eating Fred’

The sentences of (i) imply the existence of a sentence such as *Fred uu chiin laa taa-gang* or one like (ii), an expansion of (42):

- (ii) Bill-çuu x-aay laa k’usgiid-an
 [Bill-dog-def him bite-past]
 ‘It’s Bill the dog bit’

which would be another way to answer ‘Who did the dog bite?’ That is, the difficult gloss of (42) may be abetted by the ‘missing’ pronoun.

For (iii), the normal state of affairs exists when the more POTENT PARTICIPANT precedes and acts on the less POTENT PARTICIPANT. To manipulate (iii), a speaker of Haida must know the ranking of PARTICIPANTS by potency. In all these three, the semantics of initial position is connected with the foreign intrusion into the conversation (i), with the contingent (ii), and with the unnatural (iii) ... all weaker varieties of the more magnified 'noteworthiness' produced by *ϕuu* in initial position.

We may now add to (i) - (iii) and Figure 1 the apparent ordering limitation that affects how sentential content occurs relative to other PARTICIPANTS. Consider 'I know that Bill is probably sick' and 'His falling from the house killed him' In the first, 'that Bill is probably sick' is expected to be the transitive Object in the PROPOSITION. In the second, 'His falling from the house' is expected to be the transitive Agent. Neither some scale of potency nor some fixed positioning of ROLE is relevant to their ordering. Haida appears consistently to place the sentential content initially (Enrico 2003.811-812):²¹

- (44) (a) [Bill st'i-han-s-ran]_O [dii]_A
 [Bill be.sick-probably-present-postposition I
 7unsiid-ang
 know-present]
 'I know that Bill is probably sick'
- (b) [n-aay-sda 'll dllrwiit'aal-aa-gan]_A ['ll]_O
 [hous-definite 3p fall-evidential-past 3p
 ging k'ud7waal-aa-gan
 instrumental die-evidential-past]
 'His falling from the house killed him'

Thus, we may expand Figure 1 to include this fixed sequence: PROPOSITIONAL content initially and other PARTICIPANTS (noun or pronoun) second.²² The affinity of PROPOSITIONS for initial position has a parallel in the affinity of nouns for that position displacing pronouns. Both PROPOSITIONS and NAMES (nouns) are, respectively, less settled and stable, and more notable

²¹ I can find no cases where this is not so.

²² I have not found examples in which both PARTICIPANTS are propositionally based, so it is not known what that might connote (if it is possible). What is heard as transitive Agent and what as transitive Object in utterances like (44) works itself out using various means, which do not impinge upon the discussion of FOCUS.

than the corresponding non-PROPOSITIONS and pronouns. Hence, both have a predilection for the semantics of initial position.

The last bit of the puzzle of initial position is provided by combinations of two nouns that appear to be equivalent in potency. Given the pattern of initial position to this point and its developing semantics of FOCUS (with or without *çuu/gu*), what might we expect of equally POTENT nouns? Enrico (2003.54, 74, 76 et passim) asserts that “If the two entities are of equivalent potency, the complement that precedes is the subject.” So (Enrico 2003.79)

- (44) Bill Joe Ø-gu qeeng-aa-n
 [Bill Joe 3p-at see-evidential-past]
 ‘Bill saw Joe there’
 *‘Joe saw Bill there’ (M)

If this is actually true, one wonders how we could possibly recognize contrasts in POTENCY since the most POTENT PARTICIPANT, when initial, is always heard as the transitive Agent. Compare (44) with (45) (Enrico 2003.194):

- (45) Bill x-aay q’usgiid-an
 [Bill dog-definite bite-past]
 ‘Bill bit the dog’
 *‘The dog bit Bill’ (M)

Given those two, how will we discover that *dog* is less POTENT than *Bill*, but *Joe* is not. Such a condition strikes us as not quite right as it stands, and it is not. Sentences like (44) may in fact have the transitive Object-first interpretation, i.e. ‘Joe saw Bill there’, but to hear the Object-first requires that we imbue the Object PARTICIPANT with some additional content. Enrico (2003.1328) describes it in this way:

In the OS clauses, the referents of the O’s are most often quite important — they are the targets of emotion, action or crucial instruments ... In a sample of SO clauses, the O’s, even when they were definite, were most often not very important.

Thus, the second (and excluded) gloss of (44) must actually exist, but to facilitate it, we must attribute some crucial importance to *Bill*.²³ This pattern

²³ This further ties the Object ROLE to FOCUS, adding to the link found in the O+S sequence when two pronouns co-occur. Now, it is the transitive Object ROLE, and not the transitive

seems fairly clearly to be a consistent extension of the preceding emerging pattern of semantics coded by initial position.

Finally, we come to see that Haida is very consistent in how it uses the grammar of sentence initial position. Figure 2 represents both the constancy and the diversity within that constancy.

Beginning with an inspection of *wh*-questions and their answers, we have discovered a nexus of connections, all of which entail the use of initial position. Haida's challenge to us is to see the pattern that it is, in its constant invocation of initial position, asserting to be present. There may be no easy one-word English summary for the pattern, but there is no reason that there should be. The essential is that we be able to see that Haida **is** being consistent and that there **is** something here ... even if it is difficult for us to articulate. From our external perspective, we simply call it FOCUS in order to put a label

Agent ROLE, that requires the facilitation by 'importance' by FOCUS.

We may point out here a complement pattern to (44) and (45). If we place *Joe* and *dog* initially:

- (i) Joe Bill Ø-gu qeeng-aa-n
 [Joe Bill 3p-at see-evidential-past]
 'Joe saw Bill there'
 *'Bill saw Joe there'
- (ii) x-aay Bill q'usgiid-an
 [dog-definite Bill bite-past]
 'The dog bit Bill'
 'Bill bit the dog'

we can see that there is after all a way to distinguish between the semantic POTENCY of *Joe* and the *dog* (contra [44] and [45]); but the two have to be placed initially in order to compare them in this regard with *Bill*. This suggests that when there is sufficient semantic contrast between the two PARTICIPANTS, i.e. in (ii) but not (i), either PARTICIPANT may be Agent or Object. In this context, we may look again at the semantics of "targets of emotion, action or crucial instruments". In the way that the contrast between *dog* and *Bill* enables the OS reading in (ii), the contrast produced by attributing 'importance' to *Joe* enables the OS in (i). And it is the FOCUS semantics of initial position that engenders both.

The semantics of initial position may also be further investigated by holding the gloss 'Bill bit the dog' constant and pursuing the difference between two of its expressions:

- (iii) Bill x-aay q'usgiid-an
 [Bill dog-definite bite-past]
 'Bill bit the dog'
- (iv) x-aay Bill q'usgiid-an
 [dog-definite Bill bite-past]
 'Bill bit the dog'

If the contrast is not one of ROLE, its dimensions must somehow be those (i). Is (iv) a kind of 'spontaneous demotion' (Comrie 1977)?

to it. FOCUS in Haida is (among other things) whatever binds all those items in the left hand column.

Sentence initial FOCUS	Sentence second NON-FOCUS
Noun	Pronoun
'O' pronoun	'S' pronoun
Less POTENT 'S' noun	More POTENT 'O' noun
PROPOSITIONAL content	Non-PROPOSITIONAL content
"quite important" 'O' Nouns	Not "quite important" 'S' Nouns

Figure 2: *FOCUS in Haida.*

4. Conclusion

Returning to West Greenlandic Eskimo, we can note several similarities and differences. WGE and Haida employ opposite ends of the utterance as signal of FOCUS. WGE preferentially associates that semantics with EVENTS, whereas Haida does not make that association. Indeed, except in a relative way summarized in Figure 2, Haida seems to be close to having no preference at all in associating some content with FOCUS, although some content will require FOCUS when it appears.

Because WGE preferentially associates EVENTS with FOCUS and because it uses sentence final position to signal FOCUS, WGE ends by being Verb-final. This creates a problem for WGE when context suggests the need to ‘emphasize’ EVENTS when they are already final. How to make something final, final again? (Fortescue 1984.186-187). Haida has a similar conundrum. How to get an EVENT/Verb to initial position to add the semantics of FOCUS to it. The answer is that Haida cannot. As in some of the languages we have examined earlier, there are simply some things that cannot be said in Haida, e.g. *Bill áte the fish*. The pattern that restricts Verbs to final position implies that EVENTS can never, by themselves, assume the semantics of FOCUS. If an

EVENT does participate in the semantics of FOCUS, then any other content in the utterance (which will precede it) will participate as well. Consistent with this, we find that there is then no prescribed amount of content that can be placed in sentence initial position and set off with *ϕuu*. (Edwards 1982.107, Edwards & Eastman 1983.73):

- (46) Jack aanFred taanaay tii-gan **uu** tl suu-gan
 [Jack for Fred bear kill-present they say-present]
 ‘Fred killed the bear for Jack, they say’
- (47) yíngaan waak akúulaas gyáenuu gándlaay ingúust **uu**
 [simply there crowded and water across
 íijing
 is]
 ‘It was really crowded there across the creek’
- (48) yáalay an tl’áng gutilaa dáasaan hinuu tl’ súus **uu**
 [ravens to we make.up will.doo this they say]
 ‘‘We will make up to the ravens,’’ this is what they said.

And therefore there may be more than one piece of content selected (Edwards & Eastman 1983.74 and Enrico 1986.117):

- (49) chíinaay tl’áa’aangga tlakwaanaan **uu** tliijiidaan **uu**
 [fish their anyway anywhere
 xakwajáangaan
 claw.threw]
 ‘They were throwing their (the people’s) fish any way, any where’
- (50) 7ahl7aaniix-**ϕuu** “kaagaa”-hin-**ϕuu** 7hla
 [that.one- thus 3p
 kya.a-gaa-n
 be.called-nonwitnessed -past]
 ‘That one, he was called “kaagaa”’

WGE employs three distinct grammars in expressing *wh*-questions (14-16). *Wh*-question words are not obligatorily melded with FOCUS as they are in Yogad and Bella Coola. From the previous discussion of *ϕuu*, Haida would

appear to be more like Yogad and Bella Coola, but *wh*-questions nevertheless have the ability to escape from initial position and FOCUS. See (34) - (35). “Though all question words usually occur sentence initially, we have a few examples of word inversion” (Eastman 1980.8):

- (51) (a) **giistluu** k’iwaay dang hlxwaayaa(ng)
 how.many clams you dig]
 ‘How many clams did you dig?’
- (b) gaagaay daa **giistluu-gang**
 [children your how.many-present]
 ‘How many children do you have?’

Enrico (1986.99) provides this example:

- (52) (a) gasan-øuu Bill giid-ang?
 [how- Bill pro.verb-present]
 ‘How is Bill?’
- (b) Bill **gasan** giid-ang
 [Bill how pro.verb-present]
 ‘Bill is how?’

The sentence (52b) “must be preceded by overheard or not clearly heard discussion of Bill’s health, etc.” Sentence (51a) is the normal formulation of a sentence asking ‘How many?’, and in (51b), in which the question is not sentence initial, “No boundary or topic-marking particles occur in this sentence and the question word *giistluu* ‘how many?’ is followed by a verb ending which functions to make the sentence complete”. The option represented by (51b) recalls the West Greenlandic Eskimo, in which a question word could remain *in situ*, or occur sentence initially or sentence finally, in which case the question word was accompanied by verbal morphology **and** functioned semantically as a FOCUS, because sentence final position was the grammatical mark of FOCUS. Although (51b) is a formal parallel to the WGE (15), semantically they are not identical because FOCUS is sentence final in WGE but not in Haida. On the other end, Haida (51a) is formally parallel to WGE (16), but again they are not semantically parallel, again because Haida is FOCUS initial and WGE is not. WGE (8a) and (14) place *wh*-words in the position their non-question word equivalents would be

placed and are therefore similar to Haida (52a). But whereas Haida strongly associates *wh*-words with FOCUS, WGE does not. So again, these pairings are not semantically parallel.

In the formulation of FOCUS, Haida then appears to be the mirror image of West Greenlandic Eskimo. WGE is organized about an order of SOV, but uses final position to mark FOCUS. WGE assigns the content of FOCUS preferentially to the EVENT, and this is changed only when some content other than the EVENT is placed finally. Haida preferentially assigns FOCUS according to Figure 2, using sentence initial position. When that preference is broken, the material that is FOCUS is placed sentence initially (and sometimes marked by *ϕuu*).

Haida also has similarities with Yogad. Both languages exploit sentence initial position to signal FOCUS, and both place the question word in that position, normally associating FOCUS with the content of *wh*-words. They differ in how they assign preferential association of FOCUS. In Yogad, the normal association of FOCUS is with the EVENT, hence Yogad is Verb initial because the language is FOCUS initial. Haida, because it makes other associations of FOCUS, becomes EVENT final.

If we take the grammar seriously, we are assured that we are in each language internally dealing with the same phenomenon. Each internal variation permits us to add to our understanding of the semantic constitution of FOCUS in WGE and Haida. Across languages, we become increasingly comfortable that what we have been looking at in Eastern Armenian, Rwanda, Yogad, WGE, and Haida are the same thing. Reliance on the initial heuristic is augmented and then replaced by the recurrence of the identical themes. Collections of associations (and avoidances of association, e.g. FOCUS and Agents/Subjects) reappear from language to language. Our grasp of FOCUS and our understanding of it comes from this short experience with it. If we are able to see the sense of FOCUS and to come to terms with it, then we are not so compelled to distill the phenomenon into some definition. We can understand it for what it is.

[Completed: May 31, 2005]
[Version: December 19, 2020]